

3

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

LEGAL\_US\_W # 56515875.2

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA; PLAINTIFF TINA HOPSON AND TO HER ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, EDWARD J. WYNNE AND J.E.B. PICKETT AT THE WYNNE LAW FIRM:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on February 7, 2008, defendants Hanesbrands Inc. and Sara Lee Corporation (collectively, "Defendants") removed this action from the Superior Court of California in and for the County of Marin ("Superior Court") to this Court, based on federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1441(a) and (b), and, in support of removal, Defendants allege as follows:

1. On or about May 21, 2007, plaintiff Tina Hopson ("Plaintiff") filed a Complaint in the Superior Court entitled: "Tina Hopson, individually, and on behalf of others similarly situated, v. Hanesbrands, Inc.; Sara Lee Corporation and Does 1 through 50, inclusive," designated as Case No. CV072378. The Complaint alleged two purported causes of action as follows: (1) Violations of the California Labor Code, including violation of California statutory provisions regarding overtime pay, vacation time, payment of wages at the time of discharge, meal and rest breaks, pay stubs, and recordkeeping; and (2) Violations of California Business and Professions Code section 17200. The allegations of the Complaint are incorporated into this notice by reference without necessarily admitting the truth of any of them. The Complaint was not served on Defendants.

2. On or about July 27, 2007, Plaintiff filed and served a First Amended Complaint and Summons. The First Amended Complaint included the parties described in Paragraph 1, *supra*, and added allegations under California Labor Code sections 2698 and 2699 to the first cause of action. A copy of the First Amended Complaint is attached as Exhibit B to the

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7

Declaration of Anne Nergaard In Support of Notice of Removal. See Declaration of Anne Nergaard ("Nergaard Decl." or "Nergaard Declaration"), ¶ 3.

3. Defendants filed and served their Answer to the First Amended Complaint on August 27, 2007. A copy of the Answer is attached as Exhibit C to the Nergaard Declaration. See Nergaard Decl. ¶ 4.

- 4. On or about January 3, 2008, Plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint in the Superior Court and a Joint Stipulation and Order regarding the Filing of the Second Amended Complaint. The Second Amended Complaint included the parties described in Paragraph 1, supra. The Second Amended Complaint included the causes of action raised in the First Amended Complaint and added a third cause of action under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. section 201 et seq. The Superior Court entered the stipulation on January 3, 2008. Defendants accepted service of the Second Amended Complaint on January 11, 2008. A copy of the Second Amended Complaint, Joint Stipulation and Order Re: Filing of Second Amended Complaint, and Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt of the Second Amended Complaint are attached as Exhibits D, E and F, respectively, to the Nergaard Declaration. See Nergaard Decl. ¶ 5.
- 5. On February 6, 2008, Defendants filed an Answer to the Second Amended Complaint. A copy of the Answer to the Second Amended Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit G to the Nergaard Declaration. See Nergaard Decl. ¶ 6.
- Does 1 through 50 are unnamed and unknown, and, therefore, have not 6. been served with Plaintiff's Summons, the First Amended Complaint, or the Second Amended Complaint.

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

7. Defendants have also been served with a Notice of Unavailability of Counsel (received December 5, 2007). A copy of the Notice of Unavailability of Counsel is attached as Exhibit H to the Nergaard Declaration. *See* Nergaard Decl. ¶ 7. Defendants have not been served with any other process, pleadings, or orders.

- 8. Defendants Hanesbrands Inc. and Sara Lee Corporation join in the removal of this action.
- 9. The Second Amended Complaint added a cause of action under federal law, 29 U.S.C. section 201 *et seq*. The previously served complaints the Complaint and First Amended Complaint did not include a cause of action under federal law. *See* Nergaard Decl. ¶ 4; Exh. B. Defendants accepted service of the Second Amended Complaint on January 11, 2008. *See id.* ¶ 5, Exh. F. Accordingly, this Notice of Removal is being filed timely pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).
- Venue of this Action is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
   section 1441(a) because the Superior Court is located within this District.
- 11. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. section 1446(d), Defendants will, promptly after filing the Notice of Removal, give written notice of the Notice of Removal to the adverse party and will file a copy of this Notice of Removal with the Superior Court. A true and correct copy of this Notice is attached as Exhibit I to the Nergaard Declaration. *See* Nergaard Decl. ¶ 8.

2,

## REMOVAL IS BASED ON FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION

12. This is a civil action over which this Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1331 and is one which Defendants may remove to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1441(b) based upon federal question jurisdiction.

13. The Complaint properly may be removed on the basis of federal question jurisdiction. This Court has original jurisdiction because Plaintiff alleges a claim that arises under federal law. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

14. Plaintiff's third cause of action arises under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et seq. ("FLSA").

must be paid overtime, equal to 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay, for all hours worked in excess of 40 per week," that the class of persons Plaintiff purports to represent in this cause of action, the existence of which is expressly denied by Defendants, "work[ed] more than 40 hours per week but were not paid overtime at a rate equal to 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay." Plaintiff further alleges that the class of persons Plaintiff purports to represent in this cause of action, the existence of which is expressly denied by Defendants, "do not meet the tests for exempt status under the FLSA." *See* Second Amended Complaint ¶¶ 31, 32, at Nergaard Decl. ¶ 5 Exh. C. Based on these allegations, the Complaint properly may be removed on the basis of federal question jurisdiction under the FLSA. Thus, pursuant to Section 216(b), the third cause of LEGAL\_US\_W # 56515875.2

action in Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint raises a federal question over which this Court
has jurisdiction.

4

5

6

1

2

3

16. Accordingly, because Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint arises "under the . . . laws . . . of the United States," 28 U.S.C. section 1331, it is removable to federal court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b).

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

17. This Court has and should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any and all remaining state law claims in the Complaint because they are "so related to claims in the action within the original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution." 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a); see also Executive Software N. Am. v. United States Dist. Court, 24 F.3d 1545, 1555 (9th Cir. 1994) (power to entertain supplemental jurisdiction conferred in mandatory terms). Consequently, considerations of judicial economy and fairness to litigants require that all of Plaintiff's causes of actions against Defendants be litigated together in a single action. See United Mine Workers v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 725-26 (1966).

19

20

21

18

## INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

22

23

24

25

26

27

18. This is a civil action originally filed in Marin County Superior Court. Hanesbrands Inc. employed Service Associates (employees who allegedly form the purported class) in California during the relevant statutory time period. During some or all of her employment, the Plaintiff resided in San Mateo County. All civil actions that arise in Marin County and San Mateo County shall be assigned to the San Francisco Division or the Oakland

28

1	Division. N.D. CAL. CIV. RULE 3-2(d). Therefore, this action is properly assigned to the San				
2	Francisco Division or Oakland Division.				
3					
4	WHEREFORE, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1441, this action is				
5	removed to this Court from the Superior Court.				
6					
7					
8	DATED: February 7, 2008 PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP				
9					
10	By: Ann W. Nergard				
11					
12	Attorneys for Defendants HANESBRANDS INC. SARA LEE CORPORATION				
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18 19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27	r				
28					
	LEGAL_US_W # 56515875.2 -6- NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF CIVIL ACTION				
	HOTICE OF REMOVAL OF CIVIL ACTION				

∥ Case 3:08-cv-00844-EDL Document 1 Filed 02/07/2008 Page 7 of 7

Document 1-2

Filed 02/07/2008

The JS 44 (Rev. 12/07) (cand rev 1-16-08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
Tina Hopson		Hanesbrands Inc., Sara Lee Corporation			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLA INT IFF CASES)  (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Edward J. Wynne Wynne Law Firm 100 Drakes Landing Rd., Suite 275 Greenbrae, CA 94904 (415) 461-6400 (See Attachment)		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.  Attorneys (If Known) M. Kirby C. Wilcox Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP 55 Second Street, 24th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 856-7000 (See Attachment)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	II. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff  (For Diversity Cases Only)  PTF DEF PTF DEF  One Box for Defendant)  PTF DEF			
U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	ot a Party)	Citizen of This State 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State			
2 U.S. Government 4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of	f Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5  Of Business In Another State  Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6			
		Foreign Country			
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Onl		ADR			
CONTRACT TO	DRTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUS			
110 Insurance   120 Marine   130 Miller Act   140 Negotiable Instrument   150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment   151 Medicare Act   152 Recovery of Defaulted   Student Loans   (Excl. Veterans)   153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits   160 Stockholders' Suits   190 Other Contract   195 Contract Product Liability   196 Franchise   195 Contract Product Liability   196 Franchise   220 Foreclosure   230 Rent Lease & Ejectment   240 Torts to Land   245 Tort Product Liability   290 All Other Real Property   1441 Woting   1442 Employment   1443 Housing/ Accommodations   1444 Welfare   1445 Amer. w/Disabilities Other   1440 Other Civil Rights	550 Civil Rights	G20 Other Food & Drug   G25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881   G30 Liquor Laws   G40 R.R. & Truck   G50 Airline Regs.   G60 Occupational   Safety/Health   G40 Other   G40 Ot			
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  1 Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 another district 6 Multidistrict 7 Judge from Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened (specify)  Litigation Magistrate Judgment					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  29 U.S.C. section 201 et seq.  Brief description of cause: Fair Labor Standards Act; failure to pay overtime.					
VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 DURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☐ No					
IF ANY "NOTICE OF RELATED CASE".					
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3- (PLACE AND "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)  DATE	\ <b>\</b>	SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND SAN JOSE			
February 7, 2008 Dane W. Mergard					

## ATTACHMENT TO CIVIL COVER SHEET

Wynne Law Firm J.É.B. Pickett

Attorney for Plaintiff

100 Drakes Landing Road, Suite 275 Greenbrae, CA 94904 

Telephone: (415) 461-6400

Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP

Attorney for Defendants

Anne W. Nergaard, Esq. 

55 Second Street, Twenty-Fourth Floor San Francisco, CA 94105

Telephone: (415) 856-7000

LEGAL\_US\_W # 58094997.1

ATTACHMENT TO CIVIL COVER SHEET